



Namibia RSRC Activity: Evaluation Design Report

1 October, 2014 (Revised 7 October, 2015)

Authors: Chris Coward, Michelle Fellows, Andy Gordon, Araba Sey

Submitted by:

Technology & Social Change Group
University of Washington Information School
Seattle, WA

Contact:

Chris Coward
Principal Research Scientist & Director
ccoward@uw.edu
206.616.9102

Acronyms

CDLC – Community Development Learning Center

COSDEC – Community Skills Development Center

ILMS – Integrated Library Management System

M&E – Monitoring and evaluation

MCA Namibia or MCA-N – Millennium Challenge Account Namibia

MCC – Millennium Challenge Corporation

MoE – Ministry of Education

NAMCOL – Namibian College of Open Learning

NLAS – Namibia Library and Archives Service

RSRC – Regional Resource and Study Centers

SME – Small and Medium Enterprises

TASCHA – Technology & Social Change Group

UNAM – University of Namibia

UW – University of Washington

Table of Contents

Acronyms	2
List of Figures	5
1. Introduction.....	6
1.1 Background.....	6
1.1.1 Current status of project	7
1.1.2 Objectives of this report.....	7
2. Overview of the Compact and the Intervention Evaluated	8
2.1 Overview of the project and implementation plan.....	8
2.1.1 Program participants	9
2.1.2 Geographic coverage	9
2.2 Program logic	11
3. Literature Review.....	13
4. Evaluation Design.....	14
4.1 Policy relevance of the evaluation	14
4.2 Overview of the performance evaluation.....	15
4.3 Timeframe	16
4.4 Evaluation questions	16
4.5 Methodology.....	19
4.5.1 Overarching considerations.....	19
4.5.2 Geography	20
4.5.3 Methods overview	20

4.6	Study sample	24
4.6.1	Quantitative samples	25
4.6.2	Qualitative samples	26
4.7	Limitations and challenges	28
5.	Data considerations	29
5.1	Data needs (NLAS)	29
5.2	Proposal to measure implementation fidelity.....	30
5.3	Summary of IRB requirements and clearances.....	31
5.4	Preparing data files for access, privacy and documentation	31
5.5	Dissemination plan	31
5.6	Reporting schedule	31
5.7	Evaluation team roles and responsibilities	32
6	Figures	33
7	Attachments.....	39
	Revisions – July 23, 2015	67

List of Figures

Figure 1: Operations Program Logic	Attached
Figure 2: Services Program Logic	Attached
Figure 3: Evaluation Design Overview	33
Figure 4: Methods Overview.....	35

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

As part of its Compact with the Government of Namibia, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) is funding the Regional Study and Resource Center (RSRC) activity. The RSRC activity will construct and develop programming for three RSRCs with accompanying mobile library units. The entire Compact is \$304.5 million, of which the budget for this activity is \$20.8 million.

The Regional Study and Resource Centers have been designed as major new resources in each of the three initial locations. Their design, collections, staffing, and areas of emphasis are meant to offer a range of specific services and activities to patrons and in their communities, to highlight the importance of literacy and learning to every age and income level, and to signal the urgency of promoting a “learning culture” throughout the entire country. If the RSRCs succeed in achieving their aspirations, their successes should be apparent in the lives and activities of their patrons, in their communities, and in Namibia more generally.

Specific reasons for constructing these RSRCs and the ways in which MCC and the Millennium Challenge Account Namibia (MCA-N) are attempting to assist Namibia, are described in the MCA-N Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (*italics added for emphasis*):

MCA-N is constructing the first 3 of what will eventually be 13 large resource centers (one in each of Namibia’s 13 regions) that provide a wealth of documentation, information resources, training materials and programs, as well as study facilities to local residents, providing them with a *nearby, well-stocked resource for advancing their knowledge*.¹ The vision is of centers that extend beyond the traditional role of public libraries *and*

¹ There are now 14 regions. Since this plan has been created, one of Namibia’s regions has been split into two.

enhance efforts to develop Namibian society, including supporting civic, education and entrepreneurial information needs.

Technical assistance and training to RSRC staff (will provide) guidance in developing the *RSRCs into key components of a regionally administered and community focused library system* (and) help *implement a national Integrated Library Management System*, which will digitize many aspects of library service.

Accordingly, the RSRCs are intended to accomplish more than meeting the information needs of the communities in which they are located; the aim is to catalyze a new culture of reading and learning that will ripple throughout the country, propelling national learning, creativity, entrepreneurship, and civic engagement.

1.1.1 Current status of project

The project is midway through the fourth year, with the Compact coming to an end in September 2014. Overall, the project is behind schedule. The RSRC openings were originally targeted for early 2013 and are currently scheduled for September and October 2014. There is limited time remaining for completing all of the necessary preparations for the opening of the centers. This situation points to several important elements that should be covered in the evaluation, as described later.

1.1.2 Objectives of this report

This Evaluation Design Report documents the evaluation questions and methodology that will guide the evaluation. This report incorporates feedback from MCC, MCA-N, and the Namibia Library and Archives Service (NLAS). The evaluators are confident that their cooperation will yield useful information for the evaluation and all major stakeholders.

2. Overview of the Compact and the Intervention Evaluated

2.1 Overview of the project and implementation plan

As stated in the RFQ:

[The] Compact's RSRC Activity will construct and develop programming for three RSRCs with accompanying mobile units. The new RSRCs will provide an alternative to the 57 existing one-room community libraries that are considered to have insufficient space and collections to meet demand. The design of the RSRCs was based on consultations with library staff and users in the relevant regions, adult education and Community Learning and Development Center officials, and Ministry of Education (MoE) administrators. Each RSRC will provide a study area comprised of two rooms, which will accommodate 100-200 study places, in addition to a library hall, computer training room, TV and media room, research rooms, two community meeting rooms, and a librarian office, with full equipment and furnishings. In addition, the RSRCs will have electricity and internet access.

The three initial centers are pilots. The Government of Namibia's experience with these centers will inform the eventual design and implementation of RSRCs in the country's other regions. As such, it is important that this performance evaluation capture lessons that decision-makers can use for the planned nationwide expansion.

The late openings of the RSRCs are the result of several inter-related delays; among the most pressing are internet installation, ILMS installation, staff recruitment, staff training, and mobile library unit delivery. There will be a rush until the end of the Compact in September 2014 to ensure that these basic elements are in place to commence operations. Among issues to track are responses to issues that arise, particularly those that may influence the ongoing effectiveness and sustainability of the centers.

2.1.1 Program participants

Stakeholders of the RSRC activity (NLAS, MCA-N and MCC) delineated five participant groups (i.e., intended users of the RSRCs):

- 1) Children (pre-primary through primary school)
- 2) Students (secondary through tertiary school)
- 3) Business people (job seekers, small and medium enterprises (SMEs), entrepreneurs)
- 4) General community members (for reading, IT access, information needs in health, e-government, agriculture, etc.)
- 5) Other targeted groups (e.g. adult learners, distance learners, IT learners, and other disadvantaged groups as defined by each RSRC)

All five of these groups factor into RSRC plans. Groups 1-4 have dedicated spaces and staff in the RSRCs. Group 5 represents specific types of the general community that have been mentioned in documents or discussions.

To varying degrees, plans for each of these groups have been developed and pursued. NLAS has conducted outreach to schools in each of the RSRC regions, to the Department of Adult Education and Namibia College of Open Learning (NAMCOL) to promote the RSRCs for adult and distance learners, and to government agencies responsible for job skills and workforce development. The primary goal has been to raise awareness so that, when the centers open, a foundation with key constituencies will have been built at both the national and regional levels to implement the various programs.

2.1.2 Geographic coverage

The three initial RSRCs are located in:

- Oshakati (Oshana Region)
- Helao Nafidi (Ohangwena Region)
- Gobabis (Omaheke Region)

Each of these locations represents a unique community with opportunities for an RSRC to have high impact. Regions were selected on the basis of need, including population density, poverty level, a limited presence of libraries, and/or low secondary school performance.

The Oshana Region was selected due to high population density, a relatively few number of libraries in the region, and a growing commitment to improving school performance. The RSRC is located in Oshakati, which serves as the regional capital, is one of Namibia's largest cities (37,000 inhabitants), and is home to many small businesses and significant economic development. The RSRC is centrally located in the city.

Helao Nafidi, in the neighboring Ohangwena Region, is a large and active trading town just a few kilometers from the Angolan border. The town was established in 2004 to amalgamate three urban areas and several villages. As such, Helao Nafidi's 43,000 inhabitants are more spread out than residents of Oshakati.

Gobabis is the regional capital of the Omaheke Region in eastern Namibia. It sits on an important trade route connecting South Africa, Botswana and Namibia. The Omaheke Region is known as cattle country and is sparsely populated, with 70,000 inhabitants, 19,000 of whom reside in Gobabis. Although the region has a small population, NLAS and MCA-N selected Omaheke because it has a strong need for more educational resources to counter a low student pass rate and more income-generation opportunities to support pro-poor income growth. The RSRC at Gobabis is located just outside the main town in an area that is more proximate to lower income residents.

The Oshana, Ohangwena, and Omaheke regions were deemed to have a stronger need for RSRC services than most other regions which, according to MCA-N, already had plans to build big libraries (Katima, Omusati, Oshikoto) or Community Development Learning Centers (Caprivi), had more libraries than in other regions (Hardap, Karos, Khomas, Erongo), or already had a library similar to an RSRC (Kavango). Going forward, each regional government will determine how it wants to structure its RSRC, including whether or not it wants to construct a new facility similar to those studied in this evaluation or modify an existing library.

2.2 Program logic

The purpose of the program logic is to depict the evaluation team’s understanding of what NLAS, MCA-N, and MCC would like to happen with the RSRC activity given the resources invested. The model was shaped by discussions with these organizations, as well as conversations with implementation partners (e.g., IREX) and project documentation (e.g., the Compact).

The model begins with the *Operations Program Logic* (Figure 1), which highlights the actions required to launch the RSRCs and keep them running. The operations logic shows how four inputs provide a foundation for the activities and outputs required to open and maintain the RSRCs. The inputs include funding from MCC, technical assistance through contractors like IREX, existing administrative and library resources provided by NLAS, and the efforts of implementing organizations such as MCA-N. The activities and outputs are grouped into six areas: staff, IT and equipment, facilities, collections, leadership, and mobile library units. Each of these areas is tied to one or more operational goals; and the extent to which operational goals are achieved will constrain or enable activities in the more patron-centered Service Program Logic (Figure 2).

The operations model is not comprehensive; rather, it focuses on areas MCC will have funded and MCA-N will have executed by the end of the Compact. It does, however, include additional items that were deemed critical to the operational success of the RSRC (e.g., leadership activities) and some activities that will continue post-Compact (e.g., maintaining IT equipment).

The *Service Program Logic* is organized along the (patron-facing) service areas of the RSRCs—namely: School library services; Business and research information services; Children’s library services; and User and outreach services, Mobile library unit services, and Regional records center and archival access point services.² The inputs on the service model are not shown because they flow from the operation logic’s outputs. Service outcomes are divided into three levels: immediate

² The sixth area—Regional Records Center and Archival Access Point Services—is only included in the program logic by name. We did not develop this area’s logic, as it is not mentioned in the RFQ as being an important area for evaluation, nor did it come up during the inception mission.

outcomes (i.e., the extent to which people use and find value in the RSRCs), intermediate outcomes (i.e., changes in patrons' knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors, within the timeframe of the evaluation), and long-term outcomes (i.e., larger-scale changes detectable locally, regionally, or nationally).

The operations and service models are presented as linear, moving across rows from left to right in a causal relationship, but these models are, realistically, simplifications of a dynamic organization. Linkages occur across service areas. For instance, educational outcomes and IT skills can be achieved in any service area, and are not restricted to School library services or User and outreach services, as shown in Figure 2. On the operations logic, another example is the ILMS system, which is critical to collections and circulation, but also depends on staff training (under "staff"), steady power (under "facilities"), and IT maintenance (under "IT and equipment").

3. Literature Review

The literature review submitted on December 19, 2013 (Attachment B) served as a reference for developing this proposed evaluation design. Once the final scope of the evaluation design is approved, the evaluators will draw on specific insights from evaluations referenced in the literature review to refine the instruments, sampling strategies, and analysis plan.

The literature review identifies several evaluation reports focused on public library systems at the national or sub-national level. Most of these large-scale evaluations examine libraries in Europe, North America, or Oceania with the (explicit or implicit) purpose of demonstrating the value of publicly funded library services. As such, most of these focus on measuring library utilization and the perceived outcomes or impacts of use, as opposed to measuring library activities and operations – and this is particularly true of multi-country studies based in developing or transitioning countries. Those reports that do include library activities take a summative, rather than formative approach.

This evaluation can add to existing literature in several regards. The evaluation is broader in scope than other evaluations on library systems in that it follows the life of the RSRCs from construction through the first years of operation (rather than a system that has been in existence for decades); it examines implementation, performance, and outcomes (rather than exclusively focusing on service utilization or outcomes/impacts); and it focuses on a pilot project enabled by donor funding and is intended to influence the development of other RSRCs in the country. This evaluation is also different because it will assess the degree to which the RSRCs are likely to create a ripple effect in regard to the country's reading habits and learning culture.

4. Evaluation Design

4.1 Policy relevance of the evaluation

This evaluation has been designed to serve the needs of two major stakeholders, MCC and the MoE (NLAS). For MCC, the evaluation provides a *summative* assessment of the effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of its investment in the RSRCs from the planning phase through the first two years of their operation. The findings of the evaluation will inform MCC's ongoing strategies for education-sector investments.

For NLAS, which is a directorate within the MoE, this evaluation provides a *formative* assessment to help guide program improvements within the three RSRCs studied, as well as other RSRCs and libraries across Namibia, a *summative* assessment of the achievements of the first years of the RSRCs, and a foundation for ongoing assessments of the initial and future RSRCs. The construction and performance of these RSRCs will provide lessons that can be applied broadly by NLAS. At present, NLAS has confirmed that the construction of one additional RSRC has been approved.

The structure of the RSRC program and the circumstances surrounding its implementation introduce certain risks and opportunities. At the project level – as large structures intended to introduce a new library model to the country – the RSRCs are highly visible both within MCC and Namibia, which increases the stakes for both the donor and recipient country. In a sense, the RSRCs can be seen as a high-risk, high-reward activity. Because of this, the initial impressions formed at the RSRC openings could strongly influence the level of support among public officials and local people's demand for RSRC services, especially in the short run.

A related program-level risk relates to long-term ownership of the RSRCs. Overall it is unclear where ultimate decision-making authority rests, and the extent to which resources for adjustments to existing RSRCs and funding for future RSRCs will come from national or regional budgets, or a combination thereof. Some of this uncertainty is connected to the ongoing process of decentralization in Namibia, which transfers many of the powers and funding of the national government to the Regional Councils. It has been suggested the Regional Council will have

ultimate authority over each RSRC, but the pacing at which any region gains the capacity to fund and operate the RSRCs is still unfolding.

Furthermore, staffing the RSRCs remains a critical issue: challenges presented so far include filling staff positions, recruiting qualified junior and senior staff, adjusting staffing policies at the MoE, and anticipated issues related to pay-scales and turnover. Although some temporary solutions have been found, such staffing concerns may slow the pace at which individual RSRCs can define, implement, and achieve intended goals.

4.2 Overview of the performance evaluation

The evaluation is divided into two components. Component #1 focuses on all of the activities leading up to the openings of the RSRCs and the end of the Compact (September 2014), and Component #2 focuses on the ongoing operations and outcomes of the RSRCs after the end of the Compact.

Component #1: The first component has two important functions. First, it will allow the evaluators to delve into the activities and outputs completed as of opening day (as shown in Figure 1 on RSRC operations). The investigation will generate a “baseline” in terms of both the functionality of the RSRCs and the expectations of participants that can then be assessed over the course of the evaluation. Second, Component #1 may provide insights that NLAS can apply immediately, particularly to aid in the build-out of the centers to other regions of the country. These include such elements as architectural design, physical plan, construction, staffing decisions, funding allocations and others that may be both important and open to modification in future planning. The report for Component #1 will be delivered in 2015.

Component #2: Component #2 will follow a more conventional evaluation design, with data collection and reporting occurring in years 2015-2018. Component #2 will employ quantitative and qualitative methods, including: patron surveys, panel studies, interviews, focus group discussions, documentary analysis, and observations.

4.3 Timeframe

Based on a review of the literature and the experiences of the evaluation team, a minimum of two years is needed to generate robust findings that will aid Namibia's ongoing efforts to improve the RSRCs and derive lessons for future RSRC rollouts. Sufficient time will be needed to observe long-term outcomes. The RSRCs are new facilities signifying a dramatic, not incremental, improvement in the country's library system, and as such it is not uncommon for several years to elapse before user and usage patterns and outcomes become evident. Additionally, staff and leadership will need time to gain experience with new technologies and service philosophies and also to implement changes that respond to evolving user needs.

While a three year or longer evaluation period would be ideal, a 2+ year design is proposed for this evaluation. All of the systematic data collection activities will be undertaken during 2015-2017. The project would conclude in September 2018 with delivery and dissemination of the final report.

With regard to the two components, Component #1 would commence shortly after approval of the final evaluation design. Instrument development and approval can occur quickly since the only data collection protocols are semi-structured interview guides, and templates for collection of administrative information and media content analysis. Component #2 would begin in 2015 as it requires the full panoply of tested evaluation instruments and the assistance of a local data collection firm that needs to be contracted.

4.4 Evaluation questions

Seven evaluation questions have been developed. They reflect the evaluation priorities expressed during the evaluators' conversations with stakeholders during the inception mission, documentary analysis, and the RFQ. At a high level, each of the questions is equally important and should be part of the evaluation. Within each question there is variability, with some elements requiring more intensive investigation than others. These variations are reflected in the evaluation methods and sample sizes described later in this report.

Q1: Was the MCC investment implemented according to plan?

This question will examine the extent to which the events leading up to the launch of the three pilot RSRCs followed the original vision and plans. It will map out the planned approach, objectives, activities, timelines, staffing, and target populations; identify which occurred according to plan and which were modified, eliminated or added; why modifications occurred and with what budgetary implications. It will also outline factors that facilitated or inhibited the process. Analyses will consider whether the RSRCs were structured to provide services that could support other efforts funded by MCC/MCA-N.

Q2: What types of resources and programming are RSRCs providing?

This question examines the staffing and other resources offered by RSRCs (at main facilities and mobile library units), their goals and target populations, and whether the RSRCs are tailoring services to meet the needs of patrons, including students, job seekers and business people as well as any other locally identified community information needs (e.g., via programming, collection decisions, accessibility, outreach, community needs assessments, partnerships). These will be examined in context of the RSRCs' budgets, staffing levels, staff qualifications, implementation of staff training programs, and planning/decision-making processes, in order to ascertain if RSRCs are adequately developing the resources necessary to ensure efficient operations and high quality service.

Q3: Who uses the RSRCs and what do they do?

This question will identify the demographics of RSRC users, in particular to determine whether the RSRCs are being patronized by the priority target populations (students, job seekers and entrepreneurs). It will also assess whether patrons are using the RSRCs for the targeted purposes and what motivations and/or factors are propelling their usage patterns. In addition this question will determine the ways in which the RSRCs are being used by other populations that are not directly targeted, why, and with what result. It will also examine whether patron use other resources, such as Community Skills and Development Centers (COSDECs) for income generation purposes.

Q4: Do students, job seekers and business people report outcomes such as improved test scores, job seeking and acquisition, and business creation and enhancement as a result of using the resources provided by RSRCs?

This question aims to determine whether students, job seekers and business people who use the RSRCs demonstrate changes in usage patterns over time, as well as whether they have experienced any changes in knowledge, attitudes, skills, behavior and professional advancement since beginning to use

the RSRCs. It will consider the role RSRCs may have played in generating these outcomes.
<p>Q5: How sustainable are the RSRCs?</p> <p>This question examines whether RSRCs have a sustainability strategy (explicit or implicit), and if yes, what areas of sustainability are addressed (e.g., financial, technical, social), steps underway to implement the strategy, and what progress is being made. This will include looking at the sufficiency of budgets and other resources to meet operational and maintenance needs, implementation of continuous staff training, planning and execution of revenue-generating activities, and strategic use of community engagement and needs assessment.</p>
<p>Q6: How active is leadership in promoting and achieving the vision of the RSRCs?</p> <p>This question examines the extent to which program leadership actively pursues and promotes the vision of the RSRCs. It will cover topics such as: whether leadership gathers and uses information for strategic decision-making, regularly reviews and updates RSRC operational plans and internal policies, advances professional development opportunities for RSRC staff, engages in publicity/advocacy activities to enhance visibility and support for RSRCs, and develops strategic partnerships with other government programs (e.g. Ministry of Youth, Ministry of ICT, Dept. of Adult Education, NAMCOL) or other organizations at the national-level.</p>
<p>Q7: What is the influence of the RSRCs beyond their walls?</p> <p>This question examines the extent to which the existence, use and outcomes of the RSRCs begin to have more wide-reaching outcomes such as: improving administration of the community library system, generating interest in expanding the RSRC model to other regions, and families and friends of patrons benefitting from the RSRCs. Analyses will consider the implications for achieving the hoped-for emergence of a more reading- and learning-oriented culture in surrounding communities and Namibia as a whole.</p>

The evaluation questions above reflect the following changes to the RFQ's evaluation questions:

- Combined questions (C.3.5.2 and C.3.5.3) into one question on RSRC users and uses (Q3) to eliminate redundancy.
- Added a question about leadership (Q6) because stakeholders flagged this as critical to RSRC performance.

- Added a question about the influence of RSRCs (Q7) because the RSRC activity aims to effect far-reaching changes and support national-level education and economic development goals.
- Removed a question on community development outcomes (C.3.5.6 in the RFQ), which were less emphasized by stakeholders than other types of patron outcomes.
- Removed a question on recommendations for future RSRC activities (C.3.5.9 in the RFQ) because this will be thoroughly discussed in the recommendations section of our report.

4.5 Methodology

This performance evaluation will employ a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches and incorporate administrative data from NLAS. Figure 3 provides an overview of the methods that will be used to answer each evaluation question.

4.5.1 Overarching considerations

The primary intended users of this evaluation are MCC and NLAS. To ensure the results of this evaluation are relevant for both parties, the evaluation design strives to achieve a balance in the following ways:

- **Summative and formative evaluation:** The design will provide (summative) evidence of outcomes of primary interest to MCC and to NLAS for reporting within the Government of the Republic of Namibia. The design will also provide (formative) evidence NLAS can use to monitor and assess the effectiveness and efficiency of RSRC operations for ongoing management, course corrections, and additional RSRC construction.
- **Qualitative and quantitative methods:** The evaluation uses quantitative methods (e.g., surveys, panels, system-generated data, and administrative data) for statistical analyses of RSRC activity outputs and outcomes, and qualitative data (e.g., interviews, focus groups, observations) to capture various perspectives of RSRC performance and outcomes from patrons, staff, educators, and other groups.
- **Target versus general beneficiaries:** Target beneficiaries for the RSRC activity include secondary school students and business people (including entrepreneurs and job-seekers).

These two groups will receive special attention in the panels and focus groups. However, other types of learners (e.g., adult learners, distance learners, and ESL learners), occupations (e.g., farmers, educators), disadvantaged populations, remote populations, and general community members are also important to understanding the influence of the RSRCs in Namibia, and so data on these groups will be captured in part through surveys, observations, staff interviews, and focus groups.

4.5.2 Geography

There are three geographic levels of analysis: the RSRCs themselves, the three communities where the RSRCs are situated (Gobabis, Oshakati, and Helao Nafidi), and the country as a whole. The people who use the RSRCs are expected to experience the most benefit from the RSRCs. The communities are also expected to benefit (through increased economic activity, friends and family who obtain information from an RSRC on their behalves, and other ripple effects). Furthermore, NLAS, MCA-N, and other stakeholders envision that the nation may benefit through a greater appreciation for libraries and the establishment of more RSRCs. The ultimate objective of the RSRC activity is to catalyze a culture of learning and information usage to stimulate economic development and improve livelihoods. The Compact might have elected to construct more modest facilities in every region or improve the existing community library system. Instead, the decision was to create three highly visible state-of-the-art facilities that would serve as a model for a modern library system and knowledge society, with nationwide impact. National-level data collection will be limited to media analysis and interviews.

4.5.3 Methods overview

This section summarizes the proposed methods. The sampling strategy is described in section 4.6.

4.5.3.1 Quantitative methods

1) Patron surveys

Patron surveys are the primary source of quantitative data on users and uses. Stratified

surveys will be administered to five targeted groups: secondary students, adult learners (distance, literacy, ESL), job-seekers, entrepreneurs/business people, and general users.

Topics will include:

- Patron demographics
- Reasons for usage
- Activities performed at the RSRC (studying, attending events, learning computer skills, etc.)
- Satisfaction (with facility overall, staffing, services, etc.)
- Perceived outcomes

2) Panel studies

Panel studies will be undertaken with groups of students and business people to monitor their use of RSRCs, experiences, and outcomes. Because this method tracks changes to the same individuals over time, it will be instrumental in linking RSRC usage to targeted outcomes, particularly when the long-term benefits of RSRC use may be subtle, cumulative, or require an unknown amount of time to manifest. The evaluators will also focus on the reasons that people may stop using RSRCs. Following an initial in-depth interview, subsequent rounds of data collection will be administered periodically (e.g., once every 6 months) and, to the extent possible, be administered via mobile phones or simple web surveys. A final in-depth interview will be conducted with panel participants at the end of two years.

3) System data

System data includes three electronic sources and one paper-based source of data.

- *ILMS patron data* – will capture basic patron demographics of new users and resource borrowing. Also, depending on how the ILMS is configured, it could also yield rich information on patrons' expected use of facilities (e.g. residents who come for IT training; students from schools with partnerships with RSRCs).
- *Turnstile data* – will yield basic counts of daily visitors to the RSRCs. Analyzed in combination with the ILMS patron data, the three-day reports, and the technology reports should yield a robust picture of aggregate usage and trends over time.

- *IT management software* – includes reports on the number of computers in working order, counts of public computer sessions, and counts of unique wifi users. Analysis of these reports will show levels of computer usage, as well as amount of technology in working condition at any given time.
- *Three-day reports* – represent the current reporting system for the Community Libraries. They provide summaries of counts of patrons by demographic and usage category. This is currently under revision to account for the expanded set of activities in the RSRCs. Analyzing these along with a sample of reports from the Community Libraries offers a potentially rich comparison.

4.5.3.2 Qualitative methods³

1) Interviews

Two forms of interviews will be conducted:

- *Key informant interviews (KIIs)* – are an important information source for both Components #1 and #2. The interviews will be carried out with semi-structured interview guides. The interview data will provide diverse perspectives on leadership activities and possibly long-term RSRC outcomes (e.g., the influence of the RSRCs throughout a participating region and beyond). Categories of interviewees include:
 - Ministry of Education (including NLAS and regional directorates)
 - MCA-N
 - RSRC staff (directors and section heads)
 - Other Government stakeholders
 - IREX (contracted by MCA-N to provide technical assistance)
 - RSRC architect
 - The University of Namibia (UNAM)
 - The Namibia Library and Information Council (advisers to NLAS)

³ Qualitative samples are described in Section 4.6.2, below.

- *Staff interviews* – will be conducted at each RSRC. Interviews will be conducted with at least one of each of the following interviewee categories:
 - Section heads of each RSRC service areas (e.g., Business and Research Services, School Library Services, Children’s Library Services, Users and Outreach Library Services, and Archives and Regional Records Center)
 - Mobile library unit staff person
 - IT staff person
 - RSRC Director

2) **Focus groups**

Focus group discussions will be administered with four groups: students, educators, business people, and general community/adult learners. The focus groups will answer questions of effectiveness, satisfaction, and user needs to help inform ongoing development of RSRC services. Additionally, by employing Story With A Gap (SWAG) methodology, the discussions will yield data about emerging user and educator outcomes.

3) **Observations**

Observations will be conducted at each RSRC to assess the nature and quality of activities throughout the facilities. The ability to observe front-line patron services is critical to understanding the link from operations-level outputs (such as staff performance; see Figure 1) to service area activities and outputs (such as reference questions answered or IT classes offered; see Figure 2) to intermediate user outcomes (such as usage rates; see Figure 2). Observations may pick up data about staff-patron interactions, group dynamics, and the effects of RSRC service policies better than other methods. The observer will look for activities relevant to the expectations of the RSRCs, but will also be guided by “goal-free” evaluation approaches to look into the details of how patrons utilize and value the RSRCs, including but not limited to the targeted objectives of the RSRCs.

4) **Media analysis**

Media analysis will be conducted to capture stories covering significant events, pronouncements, and other noteworthy occurrences. The archives of several media

sources available online in Namibia will be searched to identify and assess important and high value stories.

5) **Administrative reports**

There are several administrative reports that will be analyzed to triangulate with other sources of data. These include:

- *Mobile library unit data.* Staff will report on the sites visited by mobile library units, the services provided, the numbers of people served, and other areas as determined by NLAS.
- *Staff activity reports.* Staff will report their activities against benchmarks in each patron category (e.g. students, business people, etc.). Analysis of a representative subset of reports will provide information about staff performance against predetermined targets.
- *Training session materials and reports.* These include the curricula, enrollment forms, and other materials associated with the trainings provided by IREX, Mortensen, and UNAM. Analysis will yield insights on the effectiveness of training activities and will also provide useful information for staff interviews.
- *Program materials.* These include RSRC brochures, handouts, and promotional materials used to build awareness and attract new patrons, as well as class and activity signup sheets. An analysis over time, and of the differing approaches of the three RSRCs offers additional dimensions for comparison.

4.6 Study sample

The sampling strategy is designed to capture data that represent the expectations and aspirations of the RSRC designers and implementers, and data which is of maximum utility going forward.

The sample sizes for each data collection method are estimated based on current knowledge of the program, target participants, and the types of analysis to be undertaken. (See Figure 4 for an overview of data collection methods.) In some cases, a triangulation of methods (e.g., surveys,

panels, interviews, observation) leads to a somewhat lower estimated number for a specific method than if one of the triangulating methods were eliminated.

The preferred approach for constructing the samples will be to use the enrollment data in the ILMS. A complete report on patrons for the first three months of use can be used to build a random sample of users in each target group to select for the surveys and panels, as well as for the focus groups. If this is not possible, for privacy or other reasons, the ILMS can still yield total numbers of users in each target group that can be used to generate the sample frame.

4.6.1 Quantitative samples

Patron surveys – Survey participants will be recruited using a stratified sample of users. RSRC patrons will be selected randomly and asked screening questions to determine if they fit within one of five categories (i.e., secondary students, adult learners, job-seekers, entrepreneurs/business people, or other). Qualifying patrons will be invited to complete a survey until their category has reached its quota. Two rounds of surveys will be conducted. For each round, evaluators will administer 140 surveys at each RSRC (or 420 surveys total per round). The sample will be large enough to make statistical comparisons within targeted subgroups and demographic categories (e.g., age, distance of RSRC from home, employment status) between and across RSRCs. The rationale behind 140 surveys is the need for a minimum of 20 participants in each subgroup to make statistical analysis (such as t-tests and ANOVA) possible. With a stratified sample, it will be easier to ensure targeted patron groups are sufficiently represented. In addition, the analysis will be attentive to outliers, although this won't affect the sampling strategy. The main trade-offs of a stratified sample involve generalizability and reporting: the sample will not be representative of the entire body of users, and so the survey alone will not allow us to see the relative size of these groups within the population of RSRC users or changes in the sizes these groups over time. To address this, we will estimate RSRC user populations from NLAS data (e.g. from 3-day reports) and/or screening questions administered by the survey enumerators. To minimize the burden on participants, we recommend a survey of approximately 20 minutes (or 30 minutes maximum).

Panel studies – Two panel studies will be conducted, one comprised of secondary-students who have used an RSRC, and the other of adults who have used the RSRCs for income-generating activities (e.g., business research, employment search). Each panel will consist of 60 participants (20 from each RSRC). Because the panels will be comprised of a repeat group of respondents, the final sample size for each panel needs to be at least 40 participants (after attrition) in order to conduct statistical analyses (i.e., t-tests and ANOVA) across the three RSRCs. Qualitative comparisons will explain variations at each RSRC locations. (For instance, RSRCs nearest to secondary schools may report stronger outcomes for students. This observation may be clear even among a small sample, particularly if the participants from further away schools leave the panel.) Participants may be invited to join a panel either based on library sign-up information (i.e., registration for related library programs and classes), patron surveys, or referrals from other library patrons.

4.6.2 Qualitative samples

Key informant interviews – Eight categories of key informants have been identified, including government officials, administrators, and implementation partners (see section 4.5.3.2). By conducting up to 20 interviews, evaluators will collect data from at least one informant in each category and hear varying perspectives from officials and staff at the MoE, NLAS, RSRCs, and IREX.

In Component #2, some of the key informants from Component #1 will be invited to participate in additional interviews. The 10 leader interview participants will consist primarily of government officials, including four at the national level, and six at the regional level (two per participating region). Evaluators will conduct these semi-structured interviews twice during the evaluation period.

Staff interviews – These interviews will be conducted with 6-8 staff people at each RSRC. At a minimum, interviewers will speak with the RSRC director and a few of the librarians heading a service area (e.g., Head of the Children’s Library Services; IT Director). Additionally, interviewers can collect data from staff people working at different levels of the organization.

Focus groups – At each RSRC, the evaluators will conduct two rounds of focus group discussions with four groups – educators, patron secondary students, patron business people, and general patrons. The number of participants in each focus group will range from 8 to 12 people, which is a standard size given the subject matter (i.e., only mildly challenging and/or sensitive), although this number may change depending on the number of available participants, meeting room capacity, and the recommendation of the local data collection team that can advise on cultural norms.

Observations at RSRCs – This method will consist of an observer visiting each RSRC for half of a day at least five times throughout the evaluation period. The timing of observations may coincide with other data collection activities to reduce travel costs; however, efforts will be made to ensure the visits are timed to represent “typical” days and times at an RSRC.

Triangulation and internal comparisons: For this performance evaluation we have no say in the selection of important dimensions (e.g., placement of the RSRCs, selection of patrons, nature of curricula). As such we cannot achieve the degree of measurement precision that true randomization would enable. We have therefore settled on a methodological approach that attempts to *triangulate* as much as possible (selecting a range of measures to aim for uncorrelated bias), and to build in as many informative *internal* comparisons as we can.

Thus, for example, some schools and classes within those schools will be designated for partnerships with the RSRCs, and some will not; leadership will vary from community to community, and staffing will vary from activity area to activity area. The RSRCs themselves are designed with different features and emphases; some will partner with local COSDECs, and some will not. Likewise, although partnerships with the Department of Adult Education and NAMCOL are being discussed at the national level, there may be varying degrees of partnership with individual RSRCs (e.g., they may consolidate services or move some of their sites and/or classes to the RSRCs). Whenever any of these comparisons are along dimensions that we understand will be important to intended outcomes, they will receive special attention.

Moreover, we will work with our NLAS partners and our local research team to notice and take advantage of *natural experiments* when they arise. For example, if electricity suddenly becomes unavailable in some RSRCs (as was the case in Chilean libraries after recent earthquakes), or funds run out and computers no longer are connected to the internet, we will seize those opportunities to gauge the impact in RSRC traffic and utilization.

4.7 Limitations and challenges

Since many important decisions (e.g., about RSRC locations from among the available choices, of the patrons who visit these facilities, about the classes and small businesses with whom partnerships are developed) cannot be influenced by the evaluators, this performance evaluation does not have the many advantages of designs that are able to randomize. Also, with the exception of a few educators, all evaluation participants will be familiar with the RSRCs; non-user interviews are beyond the scope of this evaluation. However, the evaluators expect to be able to choose the patrons, businesses, and others on whom to focus in such a way as to maximize variation of the independent variables among those who patronize the RSRCs. Through this, by gauging trends over time and by utilizing a variety of methods to minimize correlated bias, we expect to be able to maximize the amount of useful knowledge to be gained from the data available.

The proposed methods depend on the cooperation of NLAS in providing the data sets needed by the evaluators, and on the diligence of the local research partners in deriving samples that meet these criteria. The evaluators will work with all partners to achieve these results. Diligent efforts will be made to reach people in the samples who have dropped out of panels and who fail to respond to surveys in order to attempt to understand whether their non-participation reflects on any feature of the RSRC project (e.g., a differential loss of enthusiasm in some target groups, or among those exposed to some feature of the RSRC program).

The media analyses are dependent on the veracity and comprehensiveness of the media material available. Both these analyses, and the interviews, should represent the variety of opinions about the RSRCs. In the interviews, we have attempted to sample a range of (sometimes competing) perspectives, thus far including staff and leadership at NLAS, MCC, MCA-N, and in schools.

Data collection involving minors (under the age of 18) is constrained by Human Subjects guidelines. We will not recruit or interact with anyone under the age of 14 for this study because the perspectives of this age group are not critical to answering the evaluation questions listed in section 4.4 (above). The extent to which the subpopulation is described in this evaluation will be limited to second-hand sources, including observation and interviews with adults (e.g., children's services staff, patrons who bring their children to the RSRCs). We will obtain Human Subject clearance to survey minors between the ages of 14 and 18.

Some of the long-term expectations for the influence of the three initial RSRCs should take place during the evaluation (e.g., bolstering enthusiasm for and construction of similar RSRCs in other regions). Other hoped-for achievements may only show initial inclinations or not be evident during the evaluation period (e.g., helping Namibia become more of a learning culture).

5. Data considerations

5.1 Data needs (NLAS)

This evaluation design proposes collaboration with NLAS to align its data collection protocols with those of this evaluation so as to produce information that is useful to NLAS as well as to MCC. This includes:

1. System-generated data from turnstiles, ILMS, and IT management software (on computer usage)
2. Administrative reports (e.g. three-day report, staff activity reports, and mobile library unit reports)
3. Community needs assessment results
4. Other administrative records and materials (e.g. training sign-up sheets, promotional materials, etc.)

Specifically, the proposal is twofold. First, it is to provide assistance to NLAS in shaping the data collection forms, reports, and procedures for the electronic systems (turnstiles, ILMS, IT management software) and the paper-based systems (three-day report, sign-up sheets, etc).

Aligning central elements (e.g. demographic and use categories) across these systems will yield rich information while simplifying analysis for NLAS and the evaluation. And second, it is to gain access to the systems or have NLAS forward reports on a periodic basis.

Background: The RSRCs are being equipped with an advanced integrated library management system (ILMS) for managing collections and patrons, electronic turnstiles that will count daily visitors, and IT monitoring software that will track user sessions of the public computers. The ILMS will serve as the new *nationwide* electronic library system, with all patrons issued new membership cards that replace the former paper-based system. Various modules in the ILMS enable NLAS and the evaluation team to monitor the growth of new users, their demographics, and much other valuable information.

NLAS is also introducing and modifying staff report forms, activity forms, and other reporting templates that provide a wide range of information about activities in the RSRCs.

Because these systems and protocols are being designed and implemented to coincide with the launch of the centers, there is a unique opportunity for the evaluators to collaborate with NLAS and help shape the forms and reporting tools that will generate useful data for NLAS as well as for the evaluation.

5.2 Proposal to measure implementation fidelity

Implementation fidelity will be addressed in Component 1 of the research design, and more specifically in evaluation question #1, which asks if the MCC investment was implemented according to plan and completed within budget and the planned timeline. The evaluators will conduct interviews with key informants (including the Ministry of Education, MCA-N, RSRC staff, and other stakeholders) and review project documents, including the MCC/MCA-N Compact and M&E Plan.

5.3 Summary of IRB requirements and clearances

The University of Washington requires all research involving human subjects, including this evaluation, to be reviewed and approved by the Human Subjects Division.

Component #1 is expected to receive quick approval based on the proposed data collection methods (interviews and documentary analysis). This process will be started in October 2014 in order to commence data collection in November 2014.

Component #2 may require a more extensive review. Instruments will be submitted in 2015 to allow data collection to begin as soon as possible thereafter.

5.4 Preparing data files for access, privacy and documentation

TASCHA will adhere to all MCC and federal guidelines for preparing datasets and making them available to MCC and its designees.

5.5 Dissemination plan

TASCHA will prepare written reports and PowerPoint presentations to support dissemination activities in Washington, DC and Namibia. TASCHA will also abide by MCC's process for feedback on key evaluation deliverables.

5.6 Reporting schedule⁴

The main final evaluation reports will be available for public dissemination as follows:

- Component #1 report: early 2016
- Component #2 first report: mid 2017
- Component #2 final report: late 2018

⁴ Dates may shift depending on data collection and other evaluation timelines.

5.7 Evaluation team roles and responsibilities

Araba Sey, Research Assistant Professor, TASCHA, University of Washington

Araba Sey will oversee all activities of the evaluation, including supervision of other members of evaluation team. She will also participate in trips to Namibia, and to Washington DC for MCC consultations and dissemination.

Andrew Gordon, Professor Emeritus of Public Affairs, University of Washington

Andrew Gordon will serve as senior analyst, contributing to evaluation design, data collection and analysis, and report writing.

Michelle Fellows, Research Analyst, TASCHA, University of Washington

Ms. Fellows will be principally responsible for carrying out all day-to-day activities of the evaluation, including: instrument development, training and oversight of the local data collection firm, qualitative analysis and report writing.

Lucas Koepke, Data Analyst, TASCHA, University of Washington

Mr. Koepke will oversee the quantitative data analysis tasks associated with the Namibia evaluation. This includes contributing to evaluation and instrument design, overseeing data submissions from the local data collection firm, data cleaning and management, and performing statistical analyses.

Chris Coward, Principal Research Scientist and Director, TASCHA, University of Washington

Mr. Coward will be a senior advisor to the evaluation, contributing as needed to all aspects of the projects and collaborating with other team members on tasks that leverage his particular areas of expertise.

6 Figures

For Figures 1 and 2, Program logic, see Attachment A.

Figure 3: Evaluation design overview

Evaluation Questions (summary) ⁵	Main methods	Quantitative indicators ⁶
Q1. Q1: Was the MCC investment implemented according to plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key informant interviews • Documentary record 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of RSRCs open and opening dates • Number of staff hired • Number of mobile library units operational
Q2 What types of resources and programming are RSRCs providing?	Quantitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patron survey Qualitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups • Staff interviews • Administrative records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of classes offered • Size of collections • Number of operational computers • Number of staff completing training
Q3. Who uses the RSRCs and what do they do?	Quantitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patron surveys • System data Qualitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups • Observations • Administrative records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of visits to libraries • Numbers of patrons by target demographic group • Number of IT users • Number of students using RSRCs • Number of business users • Number of sign-ups for business trainings
Q4 Do students, job seekers and business people report outcomes such as improved test scores, job seeking and acquisition, and business creation and enhancement as a result of using the resources provided by RSRCs?	Quantitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patron surveys • Panel study • System data Qualitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups • Observations • Staff interviews 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students' self-reported educational gains • Percent increase in students' use of reading, studying, and ICT resources • Number of job applications • Number of successful jobs obtained • Number of new businesses created • Number of income streams

⁵ See Section 4.4 for full evaluation questions

⁶ This list of quantitative indicators will be refined during instrument development

Q5. How sustainable are the RSRCs?	Qualitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader interviews • Staff interviews • Administrative records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total budget • Numbers of partnerships developed • Amount of revenue generated from activities • Number of resources in collection
Q6. How active is leadership in promoting and achieving the vision of the RSRCs?	Qualitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader interviews • Media reports • Administrative records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of partnerships developed
Q7. What is the influence of the RSRCs beyond their walls?	Qualitative <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leader interviews • Focus groups • Media reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of new RSRCs approved and funded • Number of families and friends of patrons benefitting from the RSRCs

Figure 4: Methods overview

Component #1				
Key informant interviews	Semi-structured interviews	20	One round of interviews	Cooperation from RSRC leadership
Documentary analysis	Key documents	>1000 pages	Ongoing (until October 2014)	Receipt of all key documents
Media analysis	Analysis of media stories	N/A	Ongoing (until October 2014)	N/A
Component #2				
Interviews	Semi-structured interviews of staff and leaders	20 staff (6-8 per RSRC)	Two rounds	Cooperation from RSRC
		10 leaders (2 per region + 4 national)		
Patron surveys	Stratified sample of patrons from targeted users groups (e.g., students, business users)	420 (140 per RSRC)	Two rounds	Randomly chosen patrons fitting sample parameters willing to cooperate
Panel studies	Patrons representing target groups contacted every six months to track changes over time	60 secondary student patrons (20 per RSRC)	5 times over 2 years	Randomly chosen patrons willing to cooperate
		60 business people patrons (20 per RSRC)		
Focus groups	Focus group discussions with RSRC users (students, business people, and general patrons) and teachers	3 sessions with teachers (1 per RSRC)	Two rounds	Cooperation of participants
		3 sessions with general patrons (1 per RSRC)		
		3 sessions with secondary student patrons (1 per RSRC)		
		3 sessions with business patrons (1 per RSRC)		

Observations at RSRCs	A trained observer will assess the nature and quality of activities at the RSRCs	Half-day observations at each RSRC	5 times over evaluation period	Permission of the RSRCs for these observations to take place; (Observations will take place in the Children's Area as well, but no individual child will be identified in the observation notes); To best extent possible, the observation days and times need to be chosen carefully to reflect "typical" RSRC activity.
System-generated data	Integrated Library Management System (ILMS) data, turnstile data, and IT management software data using built-in reporting tools	Complete data set	Data collected daily, and reported quarterly to evaluators	Cooperation from RSRC leadership; Data audit demonstrates acceptable validity of these data
Administrative data	Three-day mid-month reports from RSRCs and community libraries (ongoing), class and events attendance data, and mobile library unit usage data	9 reports (1 per RSRC, 2 per a nearby community library)	Data forwarded every 6 months to evaluators	Cooperation of RSRC staff in assembling reports
Administrative data	Printed materials about the RSRCs prepared by staff for patrons (by category) and advertising (ongoing)	Sample of print and advertising materials (to be discussed with NLAS)	As needed (to be discussed with NLAS)	Cooperation of RSRC staff in assembling printed materials over time.
Administrative data	HR reports and hiring documentation, including regular staff activity reports	Selection of reports (to be discussed with NLAS)	As needed (to be discussed with NLAS)	Cooperation of RSRC leadership in assembling reports; HR data accurately reflect qualifications and activities of staff; To the extent they are made available, an examination of the hiring data on each RSRC staff member for Component #1 report.

Training materials	Training session materials, including sign-in sheets (IREX, Mortenson, UNAM)	Selection of sign-in sheets and materials	As needed (to be discussed with NLAS)	Cooperation of IREX, Mortensen and UNAM in providing copies of materials.
Media Analyses	Analysis of the archives of online media sources in Namibia	Selection of media	2 times	The online media seem to cross the political spectrum in Namibia, but do not include all national media sources or local coverage in the regions.

7 Attachments

- A. Spreadsheets for Figures 1 & 2
- B. Literature review

Figure 1

Operations Program Logic			
Operations objective: Staffed, stocked, wired, and inviting facilities providing high-quality library services tailored to local communities.			
Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Operational goals
Funding Technical assistance Existing administrative and library resources Effort of implementing organizations	Staff		
	Hire RSRC staff	Staff hired	Facilities fully staffed
	Develop RSRC staffing plan	Job descriptions and performance standards guidelines reported	Clear staff roles and responsibilities
	Provide training to staff trainers at each RSRC	RSRC staff received training on RSRC operations, customer service, community information needs assessment, and ILMS	Strong staff performance
	Conduct community information needs assessment	Initial community information needs assessment conducted	Staff design programs that serve community needs
	IT and equipment		
	Purchase and install computers (hardware, software, peripherals), office equipment (copiers, fax), and AV equipment	Computers, office equipment, and AV equipment available and kept in working order	IT and equipment available to staff and public
	Maintain and upgrade IT and equipment		
	Facilities		
	Construct three RSRC buildings	Three RSRCs opened	Welcome spaces conducive to use by patrons
	Design and furnish RSRC facilities and grounds	A library hall, study areas, computer training room, TV and media room, research rooms, community meeting rooms, a librarian office, and SME unit spaces provided in each RSRC	
	Maintain RSRC facilities (utilities, housecleaning, groundskeeping, etc)	RSRCs equipped with electricity and Internet access	
	Collections		
	Develop, acquire, and manage collections (books and other resources)	RSRC materials (e.g., books, periodicals, CDs, online databases) available for circulation, reference, and digital access	Collections are accessible and relevant for patrons
	Purchase, install and configure ILMS	ILMS in use	
	Leadership		
	Build relationships with government, education, and community partners	Formalized partnerships with NAMCOL, the Department of Adult Education, schools, and others	Strategic partners add reach, strength and capacity to RSRC programs
	Develop and update RSRC operational plan and internal policies	Current operations and service plans reflect learning and improvements	Leadership ensures RSRCs are learning organizations continually striving to meet community needs
	Gather, assess and use information for decision-making and ongoing improvements		
	Mobile units		
	Design and purchase mobile units	One mobile unit running at each RSRC	Mobile units strategically providing RSRC services to remote communities
	Operate and maintain mobile units		
	Develop mobile operational plan and internal policies	Mobile unit schedule and site selection finalized	

Figure 2

Services Program Logic				
Service Objective: RSRCs provide improved access to information and learning resources, support positive patron outcomes, contribute to education and economic growth goals, and advance a culture of learning and reading.				
Service focus	Outputs	Immediate outcomes	Intermediate outcomes	Long-term outcomes
	What RSRCs provide	Extent to which people use and find value in RSRCs	Extent of changes in knowledge/skills, attitudes, behaviors among participants (within evaluation timeframe)	Changes locally, regionally, or nationally
Business and Research Information Services				
Serve business people and entrepreneurs	Entrepreneurship training; information services to SMEs; e-business services (business development, marketing); classes/instruction; IT training; and advice/assistance AV rooms, rental spaces, work space, book lending/circulation	Business owners, employees, and entrepreneurs use meeting spaces, AV rooms, and IT; take classes; seek and receive advice; and use RSRC collections to support business needs.	Entrepreneurs and SMEs gain business development skills; acquire useful information; save money or time; and start or enhance businesses.	Improved business activity and climate; businesses formed; increased employment; new income streams created; less unemployment.
Serve job-seekers (adults and youth)	Advice/assistance; resume preparation; job search help; IT skills training; classes/instruction; partnership with local organizations; access to the national career information system	Job-seekers use library services, IT, and collections; attend programs and classes.	Job-seekers develop skills (e.g., job search, IT, literacy; or job-related skills); gain confidence; network; improve job prospects; and create new income stream or obtain employment.	
School Library Services				
Serve students	Afterschool programs and activities; homework help; school holiday program; advice and assistance; reading and circulation; textbooks; study halls; encouragement of learning and discovery	Students visit RSRC; study; seek and receive help; attend study sessions; use library collections; use computers for schoolwork; participate in programs.	Students gain subject knowledge and skills (e.g., IT, information literacy, reading) and value improved access to educational resources. Students experience improved self-esteem; more positive attitudes toward reading, education, schooling, or the library; demonstrate improved school attendance, test scores or grades; and friends and family become more involved in student learning and education.	More educated community; more developed reading culture, higher graduation rates; better educated workforce.

Work with educators	Outreach to schools and support school curricula	Teachers or principals use library resources; encourage students to visit RSRC; assign work that requires students to use RSRC.	Teachers improve instruction; perceive improved student performance or classroom behavior; and recommend RSRC to other educators.	
Service focus	Outputs	Immediate outcomes	Intermediate outcomes	Long-term outcomes
Children's Library Services				
Serve children	Age-appropriate reading materials; play space; storytime; engaging displays; after-school programs	Children visit RSRC; read or look at books; and participate in children's programs.	Children are converted into readers and enhance skills (e.g., learning, reading, writing, IT, other subjects); perform better at school; and friends and family become more involved in child's learning and education.	Enhanced reading culture; community-wide parent involvement in children's reading and learning; children enter school more prepared; children maintain learning gains through summer months.
Serve parents	Literacy and learning resources to parents	Parents bring children to library; read to children; and participate in children's programs and activities.	Parents read more to children; increased parent involvement in child's learning	
User and Outreach Services				
Serve general public	Drop-in use for study space and Internet access. Staff provide lending/circulation; referrals to government and community services; assistance with online forms; classes; computer instruction; health promotion and information services; HIV programs; agricultural information services; other targeted programs and assistance as needed (or revealed via community needs assessments).	People visit RSRCs and use RSRC resources to meet informational, educational, or recreational needs. People find collections and other information services appropriate valuable. People attend classes, read information brochures, etc.	People learn about issues important to them; make better informed decisions; make lifestyle changes based on the materials encountered; feel supported; feel increased confidence or self-efficacy; improved skills (e.g., literacy, IT, etc.)	Higher community-wide literacy rates; enhanced reading culture; use of IT to support livelihoods; community pride in RSRC; improved well-being of program participants; improved well-being of disadvantaged groups; decrease in economic and social marginalization. Improved well-being of people who use mobile units; decreased regional urban/rural disparities.
Serve adult learners, distance learners, and disadvantaged populations	Literacy programs; ESL classes; writing classes; partnership with NAMCOL for open learning	Adult learners visit RSRC; study; seek and receive help; use library collections; use computers for schoolwork; participate in programs.	Improved skills (e.g., reading, writing, English-language, IT); sense of accomplishment or success; self-efficacy and self-confidence; complete grade level.	
Work with media and community organizations	Market RSRC services to schools, churches, NBC, community radio, media, newspapers, etc.	Community organizations and media are aware of RSRC facilities and services.	Community organizations and media promote or advocate for RSRCs. People learn about RSRCs through these avenues; understand advantages of use.	

Mobile Unit Services				
Serve people in remote communities	Mobile units to provide library collections, IT classes, and other information services to distant locations	People who cannot travel to an RSRC use services provided at mobile units.	Disadvantaged groups use mobile units; save time; save money; report benefits of using mobile units or RSRC materials; increased literacy and educational resources available in community.	Improved literacy and educational outcomes at community, regional, and national level

Literature review on the evaluation of public libraries

20 December, 2013

Author: Michelle Fellows

Submitted by:

Technology & Social Change Group
University of Washington Information School
Seattle, WA

Contact:

Chris Coward
Principal Research Scientist & Director
ccoward@uw.edu
206.616.9102

Literature review on the evaluation of public libraries

Introduction

This literature review was prepared to provide context for a performance evaluation of Regional Study and Resource Centers (RSRCs) in Namibia. It presents an overview of monitoring and evaluation approaches used in the public library sector. This review will be used to inform research design in conjunction with the results of TASCHA's inception mission.

This review is grouped into three categories:

1. Practitioner guides
2. Evaluation reports
3. Studies

Resources were selected on the basis of relevancy, currency (for the purposes of this report, published in or after 2000), influence, and focus on public libraries. Resources were assessed on the following:

- Type of evaluation/assessment – e.g., process evaluation, outcome evaluation, or, in some instances, needs assessment, perception study, etc.
- Subject focus – e.g., the quality of a library service, the impact of services on a domain, accessibility for a population group, etc.
- Country – e.g., developed and developing countries, or an international approach
- Usefulness for this performance evaluation.

The literature reviewed includes multiple evaluations types and approaches, including:

- Formative and summative evaluations – i.e., supporting program improvement versus assessing if expectations were met
- Traditional and results-based – i.e., assessment of inputs, activities and outputs versus outcomes and impacts
- Focus on at least one of five domains: (1) the need for the program, (2) the design of the program, (3) program implementation and service delivery, (4) program impact or outcomes, and (5) program efficiency (Rossi, Lipsey & Freeman, 2004, p. 18).

This review also includes literature on monitoring, or performance measurement, an approach closely related to evaluation. According to experienced evaluator, Michael Quinn Patton, “In developing countries, the standard reference is to ‘M&E’—monitoring and evaluation. These are close siblings, always together” (Patton, 2008, p. 127). Performance monitoring assesses program implementation and outcomes without in-depth examination, while evaluations provide in-depth information that answers questions and is considerably more valuable to policymakers and program decision-makers (Hatry, 2004). As stated by performance measurement expert Harry Hatry, “We believe these processes are complementary. We believe that performance monitoring can and should be considered a subset of program evaluation” (p. 676).

This review does not discuss shifts in library M&E practices over time. However, it is worth noting that in the past twenty years, the field has increasingly stressed the importance of measuring the benefits received by library users and communities at large – in the form of outcomes and impacts – in addition to standard measures on library activities and outputs. The International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) summarized the changing tide in its call for papers for a satellite meeting of its 2012 Helsinki conference:

The radical change in the operational environment of libraries has set new challenges for library leadership and management. The traditional method for libraries has been collecting a substantial amount of statistical data. This is no longer enough for modern management. New ways of analyzing efficiency, impact and outcomes measurement are needed to obtain better data and information for marketing and managing as well as demonstrating the impact of libraries. In addition to the quantitative data, one also needs qualitative data and methods of identifying users’ needs. Finally, combining different types of results and data will provide new possibilities in fighting for the library’s resources and meeting the users’ service needs (IFLA, 2012).

Evaluation is, in essence, a systematic method for collecting and interpreting information to answer questions. The types of questions asked determine the evidence and approaches needed. This review begins with a focus on questions asked by library practitioners—administrators, managers, and staff—and then large-scale funders, and finally with the inquiries of social-science researchers.

Practitioner guides on how to conduct an evaluation

There are currently dozens of practitioner guides designed to help public libraries evaluate their services. A few of the most notable resources are mentioned below. All were published in the US or UK.

In ***Measuring Library Performance: Principles and Techniques*** (2006), Peter Brophy reviews dozens of assessment strategies. Brophy highlights effectiveness, outcome, and impact measurers, then discusses ways to evaluate the resources, processes, and products that comprise a library's services, including staffing, technology, and infrastructure.

Like Brophy, Joseph Matthews emphasizes the importance of internal and customer-centric approaches to evaluation using process and outcome indicators in ***The Evaluation and Measurement of Library Services*** (2007). Because Matthews organized his book by library services and resources, it is a helpful resource for evaluating specific programs. Chapters include: the physical collection, electronic resources, reference services, technical services, interlibrary loan, online systems, instruction/information literacy, customer service, and broader outcomes.

Other resources focus specifically on outcome measurement. Rhea Joyce Rubin offers ***Demonstrating Results: Using outcome management in your library***, written for the Public Library Association (2006). It is a workbook designed to introduce library managers to measuring the outcomes of their programs, and it contains worksheets to help draw up a data plan.

Sharon Markless and David Streatfield offer an impact evaluation framework and guide in their book, ***Evaluating the Impact of Your Library*** (2013). The book's international approach distinguishes it from similar guides, and is informed by the authors' experience evaluating library programs internationally for IFLA and the Global Libraries Initiative at the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The book includes a chapter on conducting international evaluations. Markless and Streatfield's approach concentrates on the impact of library services on people, community and organizations – which is a more external-focus than most evaluation guides, particularly by introducing organizations to the arena.

While practitioner guides on outcomes and impact date are relatively recent, guides on performance measurement go back to the 1970s (De Prosopo, et. al., 1973; Ramsden, 1978). One modern classic is ***Measuring Quality: Performance Measurement in Libraries***, 2nd ed, by Roswitha Poll and Peter te Boekhorst for IFLA (2007). The first edition, written for academic libraries, was published in 1996 and has been released in six languages. The scope of the second edition was expanded to include public libraries, and sections on electronic services and cost-effectiveness were added. Most of the book is dedicated to detailing 40 process and efficiency

indicators. Because of this, *Measuring Quality* is well grounded and may be more accessible for practitioners than guides that do to operationalize their assessment framework as clearly.

The monitoring and evaluation guides mentioned above focus on library services and do not pay much heed to financial indicators. Two common performance frameworks that use financial data along with output and outcome data are the balanced scorecard (for monitoring) and cost-benefit analysis (for assessing social returns on investment). Cost-benefit analysis, and related assessment, will be discussed in the following section. The balanced scorecard, designed by Robert S. Kaplan and David P. Norton in the early 1990s, is one of the most well-known performance measurement systems in the private and public sectors. Although a few of the books mentioned above include a short discussion on the relevancy of the balanced scorecard system for libraries, Joseph Matthews expanded on the subject, releasing a workbook, *Scorecards for Results*, in 2008. The balanced scorecard incorporates four perspectives that reflect the vision and strategies of a library: financial, customer, internal business processes, and learning and growth. Each perspective includes three to five indicators. The system can be expanded to include performance targets and strategy maps. Matthew's workbook includes sample indicators and worksheets.

The guides reviewed above represent a small sample of the work on library M&E for practitioners. In particular, there are numerous guides designed to help practitioners assess performance, but the number of resources for assessing user outcomes is growing. Additionally, there are evaluation frameworks, assessment tools, and indicator sets published for individual library services, including reference services, electronic services, youth services, information literacy, staff training, and several others that have not been reviewed here. There are also training resources available in the form of interactive, online formats that have likewise not been reviewed.

Benchmarks

Like practitioner guides, national benchmarks support self-assessment in libraries, but they do so by revealing libraries' relative strengths and weaknesses against a group of peer libraries (e.g., libraries with similar budgets or servicing similarly sized populations). Public library benchmarks are sometimes publicly available, such that funders, policymakers, and the general public can also assess a library's outputs.

Public library benchmarks and indexes are typically organized and assembled at the national level. In the US, this data generally comes from the **Public Library Survey**, conducted by the US Census Bureau, which collects data from over 9000 libraries (or about 17,000 library outlets). The indicators are entirely quantitative, and include information on library visits, circulation, size of

collections, public service hours, staffing, electronic resources, operating revenues and expenditures and number of service outlets (IMLS PLS, n.d.).

The **Library Journal Index** uses the PLS to rank public libraries on four outputs, which are measured per capita: library visits, circulation, program attendance, and public internet computer use. The index recognizes its limited approach:

“By definition, service outputs do not reflect quality, excellence, effectiveness, or value of services to the library’s community. National-level data required to measure these aspects of library performance, even in a limited fashion, do not exist” (LJ Index FAQ, 2013)

Other national and international organizations apply similar benchmarks. The library Index **BIX** is a benchmarking program for public libraries in Germany that has been running since 1999. Their system provides 18 indicators in the areas of services, usage, efficiency and development. Like the Library Journal Index, BIX recognizes the usefulness and shortcomings of benchmarking systems, which “cannot reflect local profiles, basic conditions or specialized services” (BIX, 2013).

Benchmarking systems are becoming more sophisticated, however, with heightened efforts to measure service quality and value. **The Edge** benchmarks library technology provision, use, and impact. The system was recently developed by the Urban Libraries Council and 12 other organizations in the US with funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The Edge Assessment Workbook (Edge, 2013) is a self-assessment tool for libraries to measure themselves against other libraries. The benchmarks measures public technology services in three areas:

1. Community value: External practices that connect the library to the community.
2. Engaging the community & decision makers: Specific programs, services and supports that enable people to get value from technology use.
3. Organizational management: Internal management, infrastructure, and policies.

Clearly, benchmark indicators alone are not robust enough to capture the performance quality, effectiveness, and impact of a library system. However, benchmarks are standard, industry-wide performance measures that have achieved some level of acceptance and familiarity.

Evaluation reports

Evaluation reports released by public agencies, private foundations, and nonprofits are generally more summative than formative. They are also more external-facing than practitioner guides, as their aim is to influence public policy and public perception, often at the national level. These

reports usually assess whether or not a funder's expectations were met, however simple or complex those goals might have been. Libraries and funders usually agree on at least a few output targets during the grantmaking process. Increasingly, outcome targets are required as well (for example, see IMLS, n.d.) but this is not always the case. Other evaluation reports are more focused on examining the success of weaknesses of a funder's strategic agenda than program goals.

The following evaluations have a national or state focus and are based in the UK, Australia, and the US. Other national studies on the perceived benefits of libraries have been based in Finland (Vakkari and Serola, 2010) and Canada (Fitch and Warner, 1998). Two multi-country studies are also discussed, as well as reports on economic outcomes and return on investment.

In the UK, evaluators assessed the effectiveness of **Big Lottery Fund's Community Libraries Programme** (MLA, 2011). The £80 million program funded 58 authorities to refurbish 77 libraries. Although the program involved mostly capital funding, evaluators focused on a main provision of the program: a requirement for libraries to actively involve communities in the design, delivery and management of the funded libraries. The final updated evaluation (prepared by Renaisi in 2011) examines program delivery – how well the community engagement approach was implemented by participating libraries – and the impacts of libraries' approaches, as well as their sustainability efforts and best practices. Earlier evaluation reports (baseline and interim) acknowledged that measuring "community engagement" across multiple sites was a challenging exercise, given the term is very context-specific and hard to define. And yet, the researchers ultimately settled on six dimensions of community engagement: volunteering, partnership working, workforce development, learning/skills, health/well-being, and sustaining/advancing community engagement. Their methodology included document review (for all participants) and two levels of case study – intermediate case study via phone interviews (with 16 libraries), and intensive case study using field visits, interviews, and focus groups with community groups (for six libraries). The evaluation applied a theory of change model. The evaluation framework, survey instrument, and theory of change model are available in the report's appendices.

The first comprehensive study on the value public libraries in Australia was based in the State of Victoria (State Library of Victoria, 2005). **Libraries Building Communities** recorded the views of 10,000 people – users, non-users, library staff, and community leaders – using surveys (online and telephone), focus groups, and interviews. The study measured public libraries' contribution to their communities, and the findings were published in four reports: research background and key concepts, the community perceptions of libraries, user and non-user profiles, and examples of excellence and innovation in libraries. The findings were grouped into four themes: overcoming the digital divide, creating informed communities, convenient and comfortable places of learning, and building social capital. The study also surfaced new questions. One question, regarding how to better serve "hard to reach" groups, spawning a follow-up study, **Connecting with the**

Community (State Library of Victoria, 2008). For that study, researchers investigated the characteristics and barriers to participation for five groups: Indigenous Australians; disadvantaged young people; Horn of Africa communities; low-income families and vulnerable learners. Qualitative information was gathered through literature review, interviews with community stakeholders, and focus groups with targeted groups. Taken together, *Libraries Building Communities* and *Connecting with the Community* helped libraries in Victoria identify their greatest assets to the community and ensure that a widening circle of users could share in the benefits.

Also in Australia, the Library Council of New South Wales sponsored **Enriching Communities**, a study examining the perceived economic, social, and environmental outcomes of public libraries across their state (LCNSW, 2008). “Environmental” was defined, very broadly; the category included the library atmosphere, availability of information on environmental issues, and personal satisfaction derived from sharing resources. Data came from a survey of library managers across the state and ten case studies. Data for each case study was collected from 200 in-library user surveys and 200 mailed household surveys (with a 19% response rate). Unfortunately, the household survey responses were largely skewed toward library users: although the researchers had hoped for a balanced response, only one-sixth of returned surveys were from non-users.

International approaches

Although most large-scale evaluation reports examine library systems in Europe, North America, and Oceania, EIFL’s focus on Africa (Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zimbabwe) in ***Perception of Libraries in Africa*** is a notable exception (EIFL, 2012). The study used outcome and impact indicators to identify the opinions of national-level and local stakeholders, including library users, non-users, government officials, and media representatives. Researchers examines ten subjects: education, economic development, health, communication, social relationships, culture, social inclusion/community development, citizen empowerment/democracy/e-government, agriculture, and the information society/digital divide. The project’s survey instruments are readily available on the project website.

Another international study on perceptions of libraries was the ***Cross-European survey to measure users’ perceptions of the benefits of ICT in public libraries***, prepared by TNS (2013). That study surveyed people in 17 countries across Europe, both library users and those who use public access computers at other locations. Overall, the study found the most commonly reported benefit for people who used computers in libraries was saving time and money, but positive educational, government, and occupational outcomes were also important for many respondents.

The **Global Impact Study of Public Access to Information & Communication Technologies** is a large-scale study of public libraries and similar places where people can use public computers, led by Dr. Araba Sey at the University of Washington. The five-year project examined the social and economic impacts, and the magnitude of those impacts, of public technology use on users and non-users. The study's final report, *Connecting People for Development*, describes how both groups report positive impacts, both social and economic, from having greater access to technology. Like the EIFL study, impacts were aligned with key development domains: communications and leisure, culture and language, education, employment and income, governance, and health. However, the Global Impact Study used a three-tiered research design to not only collect perceptions, but to test the magnitude and assumptions at a national level. This included (1) national inventories of the venues that provide technology for the public, (2) surveys of users, non-users, and staff, and (3) several semi-independent in-depth studies.

Economic approaches

Another method for assessing the value of libraries involves weighing the benefits of services against the costs of providing them. Since the late 1990s, multiple studies have used cost-benefit analyses, return on investment calculations, and econometric modeling to capture libraries' value in financial terms. Although the calculations required for these studies are typically outside the scope of performance evaluations, cost-benefit analyses can offer alternative ways to capture direct and indirect benefits, although some rely entirely on conventional output measures (e.g., number of visitors, number of books circulated, etc.).

Glen Holt, Donald Elliott, and Leslie Holt brought cost-benefit analysis to the attention of library practitioners in the US in the late 1990s through their analyses of library systems in Baltimore County, Birmingham County, King County, Phoenix, and St. Louis (Holt, et. al., 2001). Their approach measured service use by classes of patrons (i.e., households, teachers, business, and caregivers) and the relative value of different services (i.e., youth services versus technology services), and the relationship between funding for library programs and the economic value placed on them. (Elliott, Holt, and Holt, along with Sterling Hayden, published a practitioner guide for conducting these types of analyses. See Elliott, et. al., 2007). National economic studies have also come out of the UK (British Library, 2004), Norway (Aabo, 2005), and Latvia (Strode, et. al., 2012).

Studies

Studies published in journals are much more diverse than practitioner guides or evaluation reports in regard to the types of questions asked and approaches used. Studies aim to fill a gap or extend a body of academic research, and so at times they can be too technical or abstract, too context-specific or esoteric for general readers. Yet studies can also have far reaching influence, providing evidence and experimental approaches that practitioners and funders can draw from.

Evaluators draw from studies strategically, depending on the questions they seek to answer. Studies can be particularly helpful when listing and testing assumptions using an evaluator's theory of change model. The aim of this section is to show the most popular nooks of social science research on the topic of public libraries and evaluation.

The following list of studies was generated via searches in Library and Information Abstracts (LISA), an abstracting and indexing tool that draws from research published in more than 68 countries (CSA, n.d.). Search terms included "public libraries" and "evaluation" as keywords and subject terms. Over 800 results were culled to a list of 100 studies. Based on a review of abstracts, the research was grouped into the following topics: monitoring and evaluation methods, technology and electronic services, staffing, targeted populations, collections, social and economic value, and public perception.

Evaluation

- **Benchmarking and best practices** – Filho, de Aquino, Soares & Lyra, 2004 Brazil; Berghaus, 2001 Germany; Lobina, 2006 Italy/international; Suaiden, 2001 Brazil; Rasinkangas, 2008 Finland; Lynch & Yang, 2004 China; Mihocic, 2011 Croatia; Lu, 2006 Taiwan.
- **Library self-assessment** – Hansen 2000 Denmark; Bertot, 2006 USA; Jones, Kinnell & Usherwood, 2000 UK; Ikeuchi, 2002 Japan; Borbely, 2011 Hungary.
- **Developing evaluations/indicators** – Kortelainer, Rasinkangas & Hakala, 2001 Finland; Kaczmarek, 2012 Poland; de Jager & Nassimbeni, 2005 South Africa; Preiser & Wang, 2006 USA.
- **Secret shoppers** – Burkamp & Virbick, 2002 USA; Clark, 2005 UK; Calvert, 2005 New Zealand.

Population groups/inclusion/exclusion

- **People with disabilities** – Lilly & Van Fleet, 2000 USA (websites).

- **Children** information needs, collections and services – YALSA, 2001 USA; Shiu & Huang, 2000 China; Maynard & Davies, 2005 UK; Graham & Gagnon, 2013 Canada; Kanazawa & Maruyama, 2008 Japan.
- **Adolescents** – Bamise & Oyedapo, 2012, Nigeria.
- Equity and social inclusion – Usherwood & Linley, 2000 UK; Pateman, 2006 UK; Jue, Koontz & Lance, 2005 USA.
- **Distance learners** -- Mcharazo, 2004 Tanzania.
- **LGBTQ** – McKenzie & Pecoskie, 2004 Canada; Moss, 2008 USA; Curry, 2005.

Library staffing

- **Staff training** – Stephens & Cheetham, 2012; Australia; Dalston & Turner, 2011 USA.
- **Knowledge/competencies/credentials** – Houston, 2000 USA; Dali & Dilevko, 2009 Canada.
- **Well-being** – Juniper, Bellamy & White, 2012 UK.
- **Attitudes about technology** -- Goulding, Murray & Spacey, R. 2004 UK.
- **Volunteers** -- Hewitt & Eve, 2012 Canada.

Technology/electronic services delivery

- **Public access computers and Internet** – Kendall & Craven, 2005 UK; Eve, 2000 UK.
- **Websites** – Marcucci, 2004 Italy; Hildebrand, 2003 Australia; Aitta, Kaleva & Kortelainen, 2008 Finland; Shen, Li & Hu, 2006 Taiwan; Welch, 2005 USA.
- **Online reference** – Carter & Janes, 200 USA; Breidenbaugh, 2006 USA; McCrea, 2004 UK; Gilbert, Liu, Matoush & Whitlatch, 2006 USA.
- **Digital services** – Galluzzi, 2001 Italy.
- **Longitudinal assessment** – Craven, 2002 UK.

Social and economic value

- **Outcomes/impacts**-- Kostiak, 2002 Canada; Mac Eachern, 2001 New Zealand; Halper, 2004 UK; Streatfield & Markless, 2011 UK.
- **Cost-benefit analysis** – Elliott & Holt, 2003 USA; Aabo, 2005 Norway.
- **Socio-cultural function** -- Klopfer & Nagata, 2011 Japan.

Collections/acquisition/circulation

- **Collection development** – Sullivan, 2004 USA; Pogorelec, 2006 Slovenia; Walia & Gupta, 2012 India.

- **Collection quality** – Revelli, 2000 Italy/international; Bell, 2000 UK/international; Dilevko, 2003 UK.
- **Circulation/borrowing** -- Van & Parrott, 2012 Canada.

General library or other services

- **General** – Saleh & Lasisi, 2011 Nigeria; Heitzman & Asundi, 2000 India; Nishino, Nozue, Oshima, Yamashige & Nikami, 2002 Japan; Tseng & Lu, 2007 Taiwan.
- **Health information** – Oh & Noh, 2013 South Korea; Smith, 2011 USA; Furness, & Casselden, 2012 UK; Hoffman-Goetz, Friedman & Celestine, 2006 Canada.

Conclusion

As this review shows, there are many ways to evaluate a library. Books for practitioners, performance measurement systems, benchmarks, evaluation reports, and academic studies demonstrate various approaches for designing a framework, creating indicators, collecting evidence, and sharing findings. The evaluation approach used ultimately depends on one's questions and audience.

This review does have gaps. Despite searching, the following types of documents were particularly difficult to locate, presumably because they tend to be kept as internal documents or were challenging to cull from the body of literature:

- Baseline and interim evaluation reports
- Formative/process evaluation reports
- A survey of performance measurement systems used by public libraries
- Practitioner guides written outside of the US, UK, and Australia
- Longitudinal studies of library users

References

General

CSA (n.d.). "LISA." *Proquest*. <http://www.csa.com/factsheets/lisa-set-c.php>

De, Prospro E. R, Ellen Altman, and Kenneth E. Beasley. *Performance Measures for Public Libraries*. Chicago: Public Library Association, 1973.

Hatry, H., Wholey, J., & Newcomer, K. (2004). "Other Issues and Trends in Evaluation." *Handbook of Practical Program Evaluation*, eds J. Wholey, H. Hatry, and K. Newcomer. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Pp 670-684.

IFLA (2012). "Satellite meeting of the 78th IFLA General Congress and Assembly meeting in Helsinki, 2012." Available at: <http://kirjasto3.utu.fi/ifla2012/papers/>

IMLS (n.d.). "Expectation of evaluation, measurement in grant applications." Available at: http://www.imls.gov/applicants/resources_for_evaluating_a_projects_impact.aspx

Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-Focused Evaluation*. Sage Publications. p. 127.

Ramsden, Michael J. *Performance Measurement of Some Melbourne Public Libraries: A Report to the Library Council of Victoria*. Melbourne: Library Council of Victoria, 1978.

Rossi, P. H., Lipsey, M. W. & Freeman, H. E. (2004). *Evaluation*. Sage Publications Inc. p. 18.

Practitioner guides and benchmarks

BIX (2013). Bix-bibliotheksindex. Available at: <http://www.bix-bibliotheksindex.de/en/project-info/>

Brophy, P. (2006). *Measuring library performance: Principles and techniques*. London: Facet.

Edge (2013). Edge Assessment Workbook. Available at: <http://www.libraryedge.org/sites/default/files/Edge-Workbook.pdf>. For more information, see <http://www.libraryedge.org/about-edge>.

IMLS PLS (n.d.). Public Library Survey. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Museum and Library Services. <http://www.imls.gov/research/public-libraries-in-the-united-states-survey.aspx>

Library Journal Index (2013) "FAQ." *Library Journal*. Available at:

<http://lj.libraryjournal.com/stars-faq/>

Markless, S., & Streatfield, D. (2013). *Evaluating the impact of your library*. 2nd ed. London: Facet Pub.

Matthews, J. R. (2008). *Scorecards for results: A guide for developing a library balanced scorecard*. Westport, Conn: Libraries Unlimited.

Matthews, J. R. (2007). *The evaluation and measurement of library services*. Westport, Conn: Libraries Unlimited.

Poll, R., & Boekhorst, P. . (2007). *Measuring quality: Performance measurement in libraries*. München: K.G. Saur.

Rubin, R. J., & Public Library Association. (2006). *Demonstrating results: Using outcome measurement in your library*. Chicago: American Library Association.

Evaluation reports

Aabø, S. (2005). Valuing the benefits of public libraries, *Information Economics and Policy*, 17, 175-198.

Big Lottery Fund's Community Libraries Programme (MLA, 2011). Available at:

<http://www.renaisi.com/evaluation-of-the-mla-community-libraries-programme/>

British Library (2004) *Measuring Our Value*, London, British Library

<http://www.bl.uk/pdf/measuring.pdf>.

Elliott, D. S., Holt, G. E., Hayden, S. W. & Holt, L. E. (2007). *Measuring your library's value: how to do a cost-benefit analysis for your public library*.

Fitch, L. & Warner, J. (1998). "Dividends: the value of public libraries in Canada." *The Bottom Line: Managing Library Finances*, Vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 158 – 179.

EIFL (2012). *Perception of Libraries in Africa*. Available at: <http://www.eifl.net/perception-study>.

Holt, Glen E., Donald S. Elliott, Leslie E. Holt, and Anne Watts. (2001) Public Library Valuation Study: Final report to the Institute of Museum and Library Services

For National Leadership Grant. Available on St. Louis Public Library's website:

<http://www.slpl.lib.mo.us/libsrc/valuation.htm>

Library Council of New South Wales (LCNSW, 2008). *Enriching Communities: A study to examine perceived economic, social, and environmental outcomes of public libraries across their state*.

Available at:

<http://www.sl.nsw.gov.au/services/public-libraries/docs/enriching-communities.pdf>

Quick, S., Prior, G., Toombs, B., Taylor, L., & Currenti, R. (2013). *Cross-European survey to measure users' perceptions of the benefits of ICT in public libraries* (funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation). Available at: <http://tascha.uw.edu/publications/cross-european-survey-to-measure-users-perceptions-of-the-benefits-of-ict-in-public-libraries/>

Sey, A., Coward, C., Bar, F., Sciadas, G., Rothschild, C., & Koepke, L. (2013). Connecting people for development: Why public access ICTs matter. Seattle: Technology & Social Change Group, University of Washington Information School. Available at:

<http://tascha.uw.edu/publications/connecting-people-for-development>

State Library of Victoria (2005). *Libraries Building Communities*. Available at:

http://www2.slv.vic.gov.au/about/information/publications/policies_reports/plu_lbc.html

State Library of Victoria (2008). *Connecting Communities*. State Library of Victoria. Available at:

http://www2.slv.vic.gov.au/about/information/publications/policies_reports/plu_lbc.html

- Strode, I., Vanags, A., Strazdina, R., Dirveiks, J., Dombrovska, H., Pakalna, D. & Paberza, K. (2012). *Economic Value and Impact of Public Libraries in Latvia*. Available at: <http://www.kis.gov.lv/download/Economic%20value%20and%20impact%20of%20public%20libraries%20in%20Latvia.pdf>
- Vakkari, P. & Serola, S. (2010). "Perceived Outcomes of Public Libraries." Paper presented on the Nordic Conference on Public Library Research. Oslo 9.12.2010.
- Studies**
- Aabø, S. (2005). Are public libraries worth their price?: A contingent valuation study of Norwegian public libraries. *New Library World*, 106(11/12), 487-495.
- Aitta, M., Kaleva, S., & Kortelainen, T. (2008). Heuristic evaluation applied to library web services. *New Library World*, 109(1-2), 25-45.
- Bamise, O. F., & Oyedapo, R. O. (2012). Comparative evaluation of adolescents' use of public libraries in the nigerian states of osun and oyo. *Public Library Quarterly*, 31(3), 256-266.
- Bell, N., & Lindsay, H. (2000). Benchmarks in collection care for UK libraries. *British Library. Library and Information Commission Research Report*, (55).
- Berghaus-Sprengel, A. (2001). The comparison of library operations as an instrument of performance measurement in public libraries. *Bibliothek Forschung Und Praxis*, 25(2), 143-191. Retrieved from
- Bertot, J. C. (2006). Outcomes-based evaluation in public libraries: From online instruction to practice. *Library Quarterly*, 76(2), 241-245.
- Borbely, M. (2011). Factors influencing self-assessment in a changing library environment. *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 12(1), 7-22.
- Breidenbaugh, A. (2006). Budget planning and performance measures for virtual reference services. *Reference Librarian*, 46(95), 113-124.

- Burkamp, M., & Virbick, D. E. (2002). Through the eyes of a secret shopper: Enhance service by borrowing a popular business technique. *American Libraries*, 33(10), 56-57.
- Calvert, P. (2005). It's a mystery: Mystery shopping in new zealand's public libraries. *Library Review*, 54(1), 24-35.
- Carter, D. S., & Janes, J. (2000). Unobtrusive data analysis of digital reference questions and service at the internet public library: An exploratory study. *Library Trends*, 49(2), 251-265
- Clark, J. (2005). How do others see us? mystery visiting in service evaluation. *Library + Information Update*, 4(12), 36-37.
- Craven, J. (2002). A review of related work in the field of longitudinal assessment of public library IT services. *New Review of Libraries and Lifelong Learning*, 3, 27-41.
- Curry, A. (2005). If I ask, will they answer? evaluating public library reference service to gay and lesbian youth. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 45(1), 65-75.
- Dali, K., & Dilevko, J. (2009). The evaluation of international credentials and the hiring of internationally trained librarians in canadian academic and public libraries. *The International Information & Library Review*, 41(3), 146-162.
- Dalston, T. R., & Turner, P. M. (2011). An evaluation of four levels of online training in public libraries. *Public Library Quarterly*, 30(1), 12-33.
- de Jager, K., & Nassimbeni, M. (2005). Towards measuring the performance of public libraries in south africa. *South African Journal of Libraries and Information Science*, 71(1), 39-50.
- Dilevko, J., & Gottlieb, L. (2003). The politics of standard selection guides: The case of the public library catalog. *Library Quarterly*, 73(3), 289-337.
- Elliott, D., & Holt, G. E. (2003). Measuring outcomes: Applying cost-benefit analysis to middle-sized and smaller public libraries. *Library Trends*, 51(3), 424-440.

- Eve, J. (2000). VITAL (value and impact of IT access in libraries) project update: Evaluation and service development. *Assignment*, 17(3), 28-32.
- Filho, A. d. R. M., de Aquino, M. C., Soares, A. P., & Lyra, C. S. (2004). As melhores praticas administrativas: Uma investigacao empirica do sistema das bibliotecas publicas municipais do estado de pernambuco. the best administrative practices: An empirical investigation of the municipal public library system of the state of pernambuco, brazil. *Informacao & Sociedade: Estudos*, 14(1).
- Furness, R., & Casselden, B. (2012). An evaluation of a books on prescription scheme in a UK public library authority. *Health Information and Libraries Journal*, 29(4), 333-337.
- Galluzzi, A. (2001). Strumenti di valutazione per i servizi digitali. assessment tools for digital services. *Biblioteche Oggi*, 19(10), 6-14.
- Gilbert, L., Liu, M., Matoush, T., & Whitlatch, J. B. (2006). Assessing digital reference and online instructional services in an integrated public/university library. *Reference Librarian*, 46(95), 149-172.
- Goulding, A., Murray, I., & Spacey, R. (2004). Exploring the attitudes of public library staff to the internet using the TAM. *Journal of Documentation*, 60(5), 550-564.
- Graham, S., & Gagnon, A. (2013). A quasi-experimental evaluation of an early literacy program at the regina public library. *The Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science/La Revue Canadienne Des Sciences De l'Information Et De Bibliotheconomie*, 37(2), 103-121.
- Halper, S. (2004). Evaluating the impact of the people's network. *Library + Information Update*, 3(12), 34-35.
- Hansen, J. T. (2000). Quality in libraries. *Scandinavian Public Library Quarterly*, 33(2), 5-6.
- Heitzman, J., & Asundi, A. Y. (2000). Evaluation of public libraries in india: The case of Karnataka. *Information Development*, 16(3), 142-154.

- Hewitt, B., & Eve, J. (2012). The use of volunteers in local study library projects: A case study of the walter gardiner photography project. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 7(1), 41-52.
- Hildebrand, I. (2003). Service please! rethinking public library web sites. *Library Review*, 52(6), 268-277.
- Hoffman-Goetz, L., Friedman, D. B., & Celestine, A. (2006). Evaluation of a public library workshop: Teaching older adults how to search the internet for reliable cancer information. *Journal of Consumer Health on the Internet*, 10(3), 29-43.
- Houston, L. (2000). Managing in the public library service: A model of competence? developing a model of management for the NEELB library service. *An Leabharlann*, 15(2), 64-82.
- Ikeuchi, A. (2002). Production function and efficiency analysis for public library services. in [japanese]. *Journal of Japan Society of Library and Information Science*, 48(2), 49-72
- Jones, K., Kinnell, M., & Usherwood, B. (2000). The development of self-assessment toolkits for the library and information sector. *Journal of Documentation*, 56(2), 119-135.
- Jue, D. K., Koontz, C. M., & Lance, K. C. (2005). Neighborhood-based in-library use performance measures for public libraries: A nationwide study of majority-minority and majority white/low income markets using personal digital data collectors. *Library and Information Science Research*, 27(1), 28-50.
- Juniper, B., Bellamy, P., & White, N. (2012). Evaluating the well-being of public library workers. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 44(2), 108-117.
- Kaczmarek, D. (2012). Researching the effectiveness of public and pedagogical libraries. *Bibliotekarz*, (7-8), 16-17.
- Kanazawa, M., & Maruyama, Y. (2008). An evaluation of public library websites: Describing children's services in japan. *Public Library Quarterly*, 27(4), 291-310.

- Kendall, M., & Craven, J. (2005). Time will tell: How to measure the impact of the PN. *Library + Information Update*, 4(12), 30-32.
- Klopfer, L., & Nagata, H. (2011). Contextual approach to understanding the socio-cultural function of a public library in japan. *Performance Measurement and Metrics*, 12(1), 66-77.
- Kortelainen, T., Rasinkangas, P., & Hakala, P. (2001). Regional library evaluation in northern finland. *Scandinavian Public Library Quarterly*, 34(4), 27-30
- Kostiak, A. (2002). Valuing your public library: The experience of the barrie public library, ontario, canada. *Bottom Line*, 15(4), 159-162.
- Lilly, E. B., & Van Fleet, C. (2000). Measuring the accessibility of public library home pages. *Reference and User Services Quarterly*, 40(2), 156-165.
- Lobina, F. (2006). Rome public libraries and european libraries: Comparative data on performance. *Biblioteche Oggi*, 24(3), 29-36.
- Lu, S. (2006). The standards and performance measure indicators for public libraries in taiwan, republic of china. *Bulletin of Library and Information Science*, (56), 1-23
- Lynch, B. P., & Yang, W. (2004). Evaluation of public libraries: The 2001 IFLA standards and the 2003 standards for provincial libraries in china. *Libri*, 54(3), 179-189.
- MacEachern, R. (2001). Measuring the added value of library and information services: The new zealand approach. *IFLA Journal*, 27(4), 232-237.
- Marcucci, M. (2002). I siti web delle biblioteche comunali toscane. town library websites in tuscany. *Biblioteche Oggi*, 20(10), 18-31.
- Maynard, S., & Davies, J. E. (2005). Metrics for schools' and children's services: A ten year retrospective. *Vine*, 35(4), 196-209.
- McCrea, R. (2004). Evaluation of two library-based and one expert reference service on the web. *Library Review*, 53(1), 11-16.

- Mcharazo, A. A. S. (2004). Library and information provision for distance learners in tanzania: Some research and evaluation areas to be considered. *University of Dar Es Salaam Library Journal*, 6(2), 33-46.
- McKenzie, P. J., & Pecoskie, J. L. (2004). Les donnees du recensement canadien comme outil d'evaluation du fonds documentaire compose d'ouvrages de fiction lesbienne primes dans les bibliotheques publiques. canadian census data as a tool for evaluating public library holdings of award-winning lesbian fiction. *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 28(2), 3-19.
- Mihocic, G. T. (2011). Performance evaluation in public libraries. *Vjesnik Bibliotekara Hrvatske*, 54(4), 211-224
- Moss, E. (2008). An inductive evaluation of a public library GLBT collection. *Collection Building*, 27(4), 149-156.
- Nishino, K., Nozue, T., Oshima, A., Yamashige, S., & Nikami, K. (2002). Evaluation of library services. in japanese]. *Toshokan Zasshi (the Library Journal)*, 96(11), 862-875.
- Oh, S., & Noh, Y. (2013). Online health information in south korean public libraries: Developing evaluation criteria. *Library & Information Science Research*, 35(1), 78-84.
- Pateman, J. (2006). Social exclusion to community cohesion. *Library + Information Update*, 5(3), 41-43.
- Pogorelec, A. (2006). Definition of the criteria of quality and difficulty of literature in public libraries. / opredelitev kriterijev kakovosti in zahtevnosti leposlovja. *Knjiznica*, 50(1-2), 145-161. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/57681212?accountid=14784>
- Preiser, W. F. E., & Wang, X. (2006). Assessing library performance with GIS and building evaluation methods. *New Library World*, 107(5-6), 193-217.
- Rasinkangas, P. (2008). Diffusion and implementation of evaluation tools: A case study of public libraries in the oulu region. *Finnish Information Studies*, (23), 13-228.

- Revelli, C. (2000). Il servizio del prestito e l'interpretazione dei dati. lending services and data interpretation. *Biblioteche Oggi*, 18(6), 26-32.
- Saleh, A. G., & Lasisi, F. I. (2011). An assessment of public library services in north eastern nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*.
- Shen, X., Li, P., & Hu, L. (2006). Evaluation of cross-strait public library websites. *Bulletin of Library and Information Science*, (57), 48-60.
- Shiu, K., & Huang, S. (2000). A study of the degrees of satisfaction and similarities between the collection development and children's information need of the public libraries. in chinese]. *Journal of Educational Media and Library Sciences*, 38(1), 78-111.
- Smith, C. A. (2011). "The easier-to-use version": Public librarian awareness of consumer health resources from the national library of medicine. *Journal of Consumer Health on the Internet*, 15(2), 149-163.
- Stephens, M., & Cheetham, W. (2012). The impact and effect of learning 2.0 programs in australian public libraries. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 7(1), 53-64.
- Streatfield, D., & Markless, S. (2011). Impact evaluation, advocacy and ethical research: Some issues for national strategy development? *Library Review*, 60(4), 312-327.
- Suaiden, E. J., & de Araujo, R.H. (2001). Biblioteca publica e a excelencia nos produtos e servicos: A tecnica do benchmarking. the public library and excellence in products and services: The technique of benchmarking. *Informacao and Sociedade: Estudos*, 11(1), 15-34.
- Sullivan, K. (2004). Beyond cookie-cutter selection. *Library Journal*, 129(11), 44-46.
- Tseng, S., & Lu, P. (2007). Library users' views and librarian evaluations at the Taipei public library. *Library Administration & Management*, 21(4), 181-188.
- Usherwood, B., & Linley, R. (2000). Evaluating equity in public library services. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 32(2), 72-81.

- van, d. H., & Parrott, D. (2012). Communication, collaboration and cooperation: An evaluation of nova scotia's borrow anywhere, return anywhere (BARA) multi-type library initiative. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, 38(6), 321-325.
- Walia, P. K., & Gupta, M. (2012). Collection development in Delhi Public Library System (India): A case study. *Information Studies*, 18(1), 25-40.
- Welch, J. M. (2005). Who says we're not busy? library web page usage as a measure of public service activity. *Reference Services Review*, 33(4), 371-379.
- YALSA. (2011). YALSA public library evaluation tool. *Young Adult Library Services*, 10(1), 39-46

Revisions – October 7, 2015⁷

Removed references to a baseline patron survey because only two rounds of surveys will be conducted

- P25
 - Original: *evaluators will administer 140 surveys at each RSRC (or 420 surveys total) for each round of survey activity (baseline, mid-point, end-point).*
 - Revised: *Two rounds of surveys will be conducted. For each round, evaluators will administer 140 surveys at each RSRC (or 420 surveys total per round).*
- P36
 - Original: 3 times (baseline, mid, end)
 - Revised: Two rounds

Updated data collection periods and dates because only two rounds of surveys will be conducted, and to reflect shifts in timeline

- P15
 - Original: *Component #2 will follow a more conventional evaluation design, with baseline data collection in early 2015, interim data collection in 2016, and final data collection and reporting in 2017.*
 - Revised: *Component #2 will follow a more conventional evaluation design, with data collection and reporting occurring in years 2015-2018.*
- P16
 - Original: *Two years is allotted for three major annual data collection periods (baseline in early 2015, interim in early 2016, and endline in early 2017). All of the systematic data collection activities will be undertaken during these times.*
 - Revised: *All of the systematic data collection activities will be undertaken during 2015-2017.*
 - Original: *The project would conclude in June 2017 with delivery and dissemination of the final report*
 - Revised: *The project would conclude in September 2018 with delivery and dissemination of the final report*
- P31
 - Original: *The main final evaluation reports will be available for public dissemination as follows:*
 - *Component #1 report: early 2015*
 - *Baseline report: mid-2015*

⁷ The revisions outlined here describe updates made to the evaluation methodology and timeline only. The content of the Evaluation Design Report remains valid as of October 1, 2014.

- *Interim report: mid-2016*
 - *Final report: mid-2017*
- Revised:
 - *Component #1 report: early 2016*
 - *Component #2 first report: mid 2017*
 - *Component #2 final report: late 2018*
- P36 (re Patron surveys): Replaced *baseline, mid, and end* with *first and second round*
- P37 (re: Observations at RSRCs):
 - Original *5 times over evaluation period (launch, baseline, interim, mid, and end)*
 - Revised: *5 times over evaluation period*

Reduced the panel survey from 11 to 5 rounds

- P21
 - Original: *Following an initial in-depth interview, subsequent rounds of data collection will be administered frequently (e.g., once every 2-3 months)*
 - Revised: *Following an initial in-depth interview, subsequent rounds of data collection will be administered frequently (e.g., once every 6 months)*
- P36
 - Original: *Patrons representing target groups contacted every six weeks to track changes over time*
 - Revised: *Patrons representing target groups contacted every six months to track changes over time*
 - Original: *12 times over 2 years*
 - Revised: *5 times over 2 years*

Modified scope of media analysis

- P23
 - Original: *A content analysis of the archives of several media sources available online in Namibia will be conducted to discern how the RSRCs are described in the media over time, detect indications of an increased learning culture attributed to the RSRCs, learn about the involvement of public officials and others.*
 - Revised: *Media analysis will be conducted to capture stories covering significant events, pronouncements, and other noteworthy occurrences. The archives of several media sources available online in Namibia will be searched to identify and assess important and high value stories.*
- P38 [Indicators](re: Media Analysis):
 - Deleted: *Number of media mentions & Number of positive and negative mentions in media*
 - Original: *A content analysis of the archives of online media sources in Namibia*
 - Revised: *Analysis of the archives of online media sources in Namibia*
 - Original: *3 times*

- Revised: 2 times

Eliminated Most Significant Change (MSC)

- Deleted references to MSC on pages 2, 15, 19, 20, 23, 25, 27, 33, 36
- P19
 - Deleted – *Participatory design: The evaluation design includes participatory techniques that will enhance the utility of the evaluation for NLAS and RSRC staff. Examples include the Most Significant Change (MSC) method and collaboration between the evaluators and NLAS on the development of RSRC data collection forms and reports.*

Eliminated educator interviews

- Deleted references on pages 23, 26, 33, 36
- P20
 - Original: *data on these groups will be captured in part through surveys, observations, interviews, and focus groups*
 - Revised: *data on these groups will be captured in part through surveys, observations, staff interviews, and focus groups*
 - Rationale: to specify that the interviews here refer to “staff” interviews, since educator interviews are no longer included.

Updated focus groups to reflect more rounds, addition of SWAG, and merging with educator interviews

- P23
 - Original: *Focus groups will be administered to RSRC patrons (secondary students, business people, and general community members) and teachers (in targeted and non-targeted classrooms). The main contribution of the focus group discussions is to answer questions of effectiveness, satisfaction, user needs, and other topics that will both provide NLAS with information to improve services, and qualitative data to complement staff interviews, observations, and the patron survey.*
 - Revised: *Focus group discussions will be administered with four groups: students, educators, business people, and general community/adult learners. The focus groups will answer questions of effectiveness, satisfaction, and user needs to help inform ongoing development of RSRC services. Additionally, by employing Story With A Gap (SWAG), a participatory methodology, the discussions will yield data about emerging user and educator outcomes.*
- P27
 - Original: *At each RSRC, the evaluators will conduct focus groups discussions with four groups – teachers, patron secondary students, patron business people, and general patrons – one time at the midpoint of the evaluation.*
 - Revised: *At each RSRC, the evaluators will conduct two rounds of focus group discussions with four groups – educators, patron secondary students, patron business people, and general patrons.*

- P35-37 Figure 4, methodology overview table, revised to reflect the above changes in research design.